

**NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES
BRIDGING CULTURES FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES PROJECT**

Dr. William Scholl Center for American History and Culture

**“Pluralism With a Big “S:” The American Version
By Martin Marty**

The Fairfax M. Cone Distinguished Service Professor Emeritus
at the University of Chicago

**Tuesday, June 26, 2012
6:00 p.m.**

P R O C E E D I N G S

SPEAKER: Welcome to the Newberry Library's podcast of Martin Marty's lecture titled Pluralisms With a Big "S:" The American Versions.

The program was recorded at the Newberry on June 26th, 2012. That evening, Professor Marty, the Fairfax M. Cone Distinguished Service Professor Emeritus at the University of Chicago, discussed what we mean when we talk about America as a Nation defined by its religious diversity.

The lecture took place in conjunction with a program called Out of Many: Religious Pluralism in America. This year-long project, based in the Newberry's Dr. William M. Scholl Center for American History and Culture, seeks to help community college faculty integrate the study of America's religious diversity into humanities classrooms. The Out of Many Project, as well as this podcast, are funded by a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities' Bridging Cultures at Community Colleges initiative. Any views, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed here do not necessarily reflect those of the National Endowment for the Humanities. All projects of the Newberry Scholl Center also receive support from the Dr. Scholl Foundation.

The podcast lasts approximately 60 minutes.

[Applause.]

PROFESSOR MARTY: Dear friends, I'm stressing the "S" pluralism, capital S, because I don't think there is anything like pluralism. America has many pluralisms, and we're going to talk about some of them.

But I ask the question at the beginning, just throw in some names. What do Pine Ridge, Cairo, Syria, Jerusalem, Rome, have to do with the kind we're talking about in this seminar? With one exception, none of those are America, only Pine Ridge. I'm dealing with teachers, professors from Indianapolis, Glen Allen, El Paso, Atlanta, Crystal Lake, and Chicago itself. And in conversing with them, I learned that the stories behind each are very, very different. To be in a community in El Paso is very different from what it is to be in Atlanta and so on.

My career has really been devoted to the issue of the situation of pluralism, and one of the things we stress always is there's a huge difference between diversity and pluralism. We don't have to think much about diversity. We just have to point. There's a lot of stuff out there. And I've often played a game -- you can just make up any number, and I think people would believe it and you'd believe it because this is very important.

The Yearbook of American Churches lists 250 denominations. If I'd say 500, would that make any difference to you? In fact, they practically are because all 250 of them are split right down the middle fighting each other. That'll give 500 in a hurry. There are 38,000 Christian denominations in the world. If I said 39,000, it would change a lot. Once you get into the numbers, it grows.

So why focus so much as the Newberry is doing, and the National Endowment is doing, and this project is doing, on the one in the many? You could ask what's so good about being one, or what's so bad about it, because there's a down side? What's so good about the many, and what's so bad about the many?

Pluralisms. There used to be a book -- maybe there still is -- Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature. Nobody uses these heavy things anymore because it's all online, but they were big, fat books that we all lived off them. And when I started writing about pluralism in the 1950s, I looked up "pluralism," and there wasn't any reference to pluralism and the way we use that word today. Pluralism was a philosophical term. William James, plural universes, plural discourses.

It was a cultural term. We have an expert here on Horace Kallen, who wrote on cultural pluralism, and it meant a very different thing. If you look it up in dictionaries, you'll find the Anglican Church talks about pluralism means when the bishop assigns you to or you can seize two parishes. That's pluralism. You should only have one.

But since the 1950s, that's all changed. It changed partly because of Horace Kallen and others who began to reason the explosion of the varieties. I think before World War II, you lose those near you, but all of a sudden, GIs from Tennessee, or there were people from Brooklyn, and they're all different religious groups they had to deal with along the way. So I stress the importance of pluralisms.

Why religious pluralisms? Because among the pluralisms, there are ethnic pluralisms, and there are many other kinds -- cultural pluralism. And, of course, they all overlap and intersect. We who deal with religion know it maybe the touchiest subject of all. There are probably more people being killed today and around the world by movements that have religion in their name, and when you page through the newspaper or watch television, you're very used to that. In the U.S., we're sort of sheltered from thinking about that.

One of our major theologians, Paul Tilley, said "Religion is the soul of culture, and culture is the form of religion." But Tilley didn't sink in. For eight years, Scott Appleby out of Notre Dame and I did a study of militant fundamentalisms around the world. We started with 12 of them. If you want to look up Muslim Brotherhood, it's in there. It's relevant this week. It was born in 1928, the same year I was, so it's a very young movement.

[Laughter.]

PROFESSOR MARTY: We studied all these movements, and February 4th, 1971, Admiral Stansfield Turner, the head of the CIA, was on Issues and Answers. And Scott Appleby would always like to quote this because they said, how could the CIA, which he is head, have missed the Iranian revolution as it came along? Well, at CIA, we keep track of everything. We know war, we know the universities, we know banking, we know everything about it. The only thing we paid no attention to in Iran was religion because everybody knows religion has no power in the modern world.

Appleby made the rounds. I stayed at the University of Chicago during these years, but he made the rounds, and he come back in. And he said, now, tomorrow, I have a session with Colin Powell. Last week I made a lecture at the War College. I'm often called upon at the State Department to try to make sense of what all these are. Do we really know the difference between Sunni and anybody else in Iran when we broke that out? And Appleby just said, I'll tell you one thing. Today the State Department has got religion.

[Laughter.]

PROFESSOR MARTY: And the universities and all the rest of us were scrambling to make sense of it all.

And, by the way, when you're studying religion, in a sense you also have to study non-religion and anti-religion because they acquire, if defensively, some of the same characteristics that the religions do. So that's why they're all together in a sense.

I could get complicated, too, and define pluralisms and point to religion, but I haven't defined religion. Lisa Harris lecturing on what does religion mean. One of my former students, Winifred Sullivan has written a book about the Supreme Court, which always is making religion decisions. And she sorted out a dozen different things it means by religion. And they don't even agree on what the definition is before they get into the legal thing. But that's another pluralism, pluralism definitions and so on.

Well, I have four things when I get into pluralism. You can get very technical about it, but I think this is a very accurate representation. Four things define pluralism.

Number one -- it's an athletic metaphor -- any number can play. No limit -- 38,000, 76,000, any number can play. Number two, many do. I've given an illustration of how many do. Third, for that to move from diversity to pluralism, you need rules of the game. In our case, it's 16 words long: "Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, nor prohibiting the free exercise thereof," the First Amendment to the Constitution from which all the others flow. The State discussions this week, extremely tense discussions of this. And you'll get more along the way. So we need rules of the game.

And you need the development of an ethos, customs to go with it. They're very important. How much of life is that, and how much of things that aren't written down become a part of the map of pluralism?

You know how it is if you travel a lot. You can go to one country, and if you don't tip the customs officers, you won't see your bags for three days. In another country, you'd tip them and you're in jail that night. The guidebook doesn't even tell you, but you could pick these things up very quickly along the way. And that's a big part of how Americans get along and when they don't get along.

I have an illustration. My wife is here tonight, and she could tell why we stopped playing tennis. We knew the rules of the game, but I didn't know the ethos. I'd fire that first serve and the second one right away I aimed it up. You don't do that. The book doesn't say you don't do that, but courtesy to man is you give a chance for the other to recover before you do that. And I didn't learn it, so we don't play tennis anymore.

[Laughter.]

PROFESSOR MARTY: And that's a big part of how American life works together. You learn to accommodate, to adjust. You learn when you have to search yourself and in what way you do that. Diana Eck will be here next year, and she's the superstar of

American pluralism studies. She directs the Pluralism Project at Harvard, and I've inherited some of her master's students who on to a doctorate with me and vice versa. And I really respect what she does, so come back a year from tonight. She has four marks, too, along the way.

When you move from diversity -- a lot of stuff -- to pluralism, number one, it means you have an energetic engagement with diversity. You don't just sit by passively. You really get involved with it. You think about it. You observe it. You pay attention to it. You read books about it. You go to conferences on it. So that adjective, "energetic," is important.

But here's another one: active seeking of understanding across lines of difference. Most of us could go along a long time and never have to do any active understanding of these differences usually until somebody else moved in in the neighborhood, and then you suddenly had to turn active and think it through. And, see, like so many of us in this field, feel that the interrelations, if they're colored by tolerance, tolerance is way too weak a word.

I always like to define religious tolerance, if I can get you to believe as little as I do and voice it as passively as I do, then we'll get along real well. But really religious people aren't that way at all; therefore, you have to actively seek to understand them.

Third, she says the engagement is not relativist. I've been involved in what are called interfaith relations for 50 years, and it's almost unheard of that somebody who is a person of strong faith gets a weaker faith from this encounter. Why? The scholar harbors this wonderful interfaith youth corps (inaudible - 12:02) Abel Bitel, many of you have heard. And you can't be in his movement unless you are strong or at least knowledgeable about your own. He gets high school college kids all over the country together on a Saturday morning to study what does your faith have to say about the family. Or how does your faith read a text? And you'd better scurry back home to find out if you're a Muslim or Presbyterian, or you're embarrassed, by the way, in the afternoon. You then go paint apartments and do things together because active is a big part of that.

So you're not a relativist that just says we're in different boats heading for the same shore, but you know who you are because you know that if you have a deep encounter with people, the apparently passive sides of religion get very active.

And then finally, the fourth theme is it's based on dialogue, conversation. The aim of pluralism rarely gets transformed into a game of conversion. If you're in a dialogue group, the ethos, the rules of the game, you don't look for somebody to be weak and then say, I'll tell you my faith, and I'll grab you and get you in there. You are not prohibited from converting people, but in the interaction, dialogue is a big thing.

What I've begun pointing to is what I think is essential to any attempt to understand American religion. You can't just get it in your catechism. You just can't just get at a Buddhist seminar. If you understand America an American thought, American interaction, and American religion, pluralism comes up.

I was once assigned to write a book that they were going to make a television program out of, 13 programs. The scripts still lie molding up somewhere along the way. The National Endowment for the Humanities had a pass with the Pakistani, in Washington thought -- passed everybody. And then we got a new President, Ronald Reagan, who didn't care quite that much about the subject, so it lies molding there.

One day in New York, I was walking along with the agent, the only time in my life I had an agent. That was really something. I had an agent.

[Laughter.]

PROFESSOR MARTY: And it was snowing very hard, and we couldn't get cabs to get to the East Side Terminal, so we had about a 13-block walk in the snow. And he turned to me and said, Marty, what would your book be about? A book about 500 years of American religion and 500 pages. What will it be about? Pluralism. You couldn't be more wrong. Religion in America is about belief in God, fear of death, doubt, agony, murder. It's all those other things. Pluralism is a name that new scholars put on things and administrators put on things, politicians on things, to make sense of what's going on there.

So what he's pointing to, though, is you can never hide from diversity, and you can evade the marks of pluralism as Professor Eck and I have tried to outline. You can see without going deep, and yet the vantages are crucial. And the vantage you bring tells an awful lot about your perceptions of pluralism.

I've always used a very homely metaphor for the dimensions by which you try to understand something like pluralism -- hurricane watching. I've never been in a hurricane, but I've been in tornadoes because I was from Nebraska. Hurricane watchers, four dimensions. Think how different it is to look at pluralism the way they are.

The first dimension is the satellite, far off, a safe distance. You see a pretty silver swirl down there. Oh, isn't that nice? It's heading toward the Gulf of Mexico or Florida, Galveston, who knows where. Isn't it beautiful? That's what philosophers and theologians do when they talk about pluralism. They reason about the big picture, and it's a very important thing. It's nice to know several days early. But there are vantages, and pluralism looks different when you closer to it.

So number two, the C-130, the planes that fly up into it. _____ once wrote a book called the Ordeal of Modernity, in which he was discussing about the great sociologists

of religion and society, Max Faber and others. He said one thing they all did, they looked at modernity and pluralism from the safest place, the very eye of the hurricane. I go, wow, that's not the place to be. No, the eye of the hurricane, that's where the C-130 flies. We've never lost a C-130 during a hurricane. It has all the instruments, lower east-west. You're really quite safe there, and you can really learn a lot getting in there close.

And I think a lot of people, I among them, have the equivalent of a C-130 for looking at phenomena like this. We call it academic tenure.

[Laughter.]

PROFESSOR MARTY: You know, it all looks so dangerous all around you, and there you are.

[Laughter.]

PROFESSOR MARTY: The third one, I just talked to my son who's writing a book on Hilton Head right now, and he said it's been raining for several -- he said, you wouldn't want what we're getting anywhere south from here. Florida, it was horrible. And Hilton Head was connected to the main land by a bridge, and the bridge tender is a very important person because you have to decide when you evacuate and so on. And the people up close, right in the middle of it, they have technical skills -- doctors, nurses, medical technicians, media people. They can't leave. They know more about it than the C-130 knows because they're right in the middle of it, and they're making judgments on the basis of it.

I think that's what medics do. That's what priests do. The worse crime of a priest in the Middle Ages was to abandon a town when the plague came because they need their entrance into heaven with the mass, and if he was not, it was awful. He was the equivalent of the bridge tender. That is, the people who know everything that these other levels know, but they're all the same. And I think that's what most teachers are doing, most professors, most of the people in clerical life, et cetera.

And then the fourth way of viewing a hurricane I say is in the huts, the people in the path. They don't have to be huts. If you're in some part of Florida, your hut can be a \$13 million hut, but it doesn't make difference through a hurricane. If you're in the path, you'll get it. A very different perception of it. And many of the things that John Murray Cuddihy wrote about under the concept of modernity, which is a big picture of pluralism - they feed each other -- comes on people who made no preparation for it at all. We go about our life. We don't have to think about it, and then it comes. And in a sense, pluralism does that in a way.

We mentioned storytelling before. What I like to do is all my students, and maybe as the week goes on we do see enough from talking to the college professors here, are stories.

You can kind of deduce where someone's going by their story. I will not bore you with many details of mine because I'm from Nebraska, and it isn't that exciting to people in Illinois, but it's everywhere.

My illustration. I was in a little tiny town, Warren Buffet's mother's town. That's the only other thing important about it.

[Laughter.]

PROFESSOR MARTY: It was settled by Germans and Czechs. The Germans were all Catholic and Lutheran. The Czechs were all Catholic or free thinkers they were called. It was the largest atheist group in American immigration. They had been beat up by the empire and the Church, and they wouldn't have anything to do with any of those things. The town in which I lived, I could be driving on Monastery Road headed toward Monterey, which was on the county line. You went past Monterey on Monastery Road, and suddenly it was County Road M, because in that county, no churches were welcome.

I collected letters from a book I was writing one time about the Czech parents would say, well, my daughter met somebody in Cumming County. She's going to marry him. He's Catholic. Where did we go wrong? She's getting religion. We're used to parents saying where did we go wrong, the kids are losing religion. Now they were so worried.

The cemetery -- I have a picture of this in one of my books, the cemetery. No crucifixes, no religious symbols. And as you enter in the Czech language it says, "What we are, you soon will be." And as you leave, another cheery line, "What you are, we once were." Okay. You'd better know the difference if you're living there. But that was not pluralism. That was duality, and that doesn't do you nearly as good.

When I moved to Chicago, I learned, usually by parish. You'd always find where somebody was from and who they were by what parish they were. And the colorful maps, of which this library has many, will show maps of the 20s, 30s, 40s, and you can tell exactly where Lithuanians lived, exactly where the Poles lived everywhere. And you'd better learn that in a hurry.

And once you get into this, it's a game you tend to play everywhere. I once was lecturing in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, which everyone knows is the middle of the Corn Belt, middle America. And the people there asked me to give a lecture, one of my interests, on pluralism in medical ethics. I was with a group here in Chicago, and we'd study these things.

Case study of a Seventh Adventist person who was brain dead, is the word they used. And at the head of the bed was Adventist pastor who said he's ready for Heavy, you can pull the plug. At the foot of it was an ethicist who said -- I mean, a physician, who said, I

have a Hippocratic oath, and I'm an orthodox Jew, and over my dead body he will do that to him. At the side was Mary Carroll Sullivan, who was part of our project, an R.N. with a Harvard Ph.D. in these fields. I suppose the issue was finally settled because the man died, but we could've gone a long time.

Well, I said to somebody, well, that's how you talk in Chicago. You have all these ethnic groups. We've got all that stuff. So I just played a game with him. I had been in Iowa, and I knew a little bit about Iowa and Cedar Rapids. And I said, where is the oldest mosque in continuous use in America? Pulled the card out of my sleeve -- Cedar Rapids, Iowa. 1934, Lebanese millers came there, and they built a beautiful mosque, a new building. In the 30s, 40s, 50s, the mosque was a member of the Church Federation, not the word they use today. But there they were thoroughly involved.

And I said, well, right north of you is Postville. You know Postville? Hasidic Jews, Labavitcher Jews were there, town that makes national news along the way. And right south of them is the Transcendental Meditation University in Fairfield, Iowa, Hindu, right in the middle of all that. And they said, okay, how about Chicago? You've got gypsies. Well, I learned now there were 25,000 to 50,000 gypsies in Chicago, but I didn't know that then. You have Amish. They're out in the country of Minnesota and Wisconsin, Illinois. It doesn't quite fit here. But we had just about as many.

I'll use an illustration here. One of my students, while he was getting his doctorate, worked here at the library assisting on Fred Hoxie's Encyclopedia of American Indians. He was a secular, but reverent, Jew, Harvey Markowitz. Maybe some people might remember Harvey. He's hard to forget. And he was studying the Lakota Sioux and the Red ____ Reservation, South Dakota. And was so adapted to it, so acclimatized to it that he was adopted by a tribe, and his name there was Harvey Horse Looking, which meant -- well. And there are about Horse Lookings in the phone book on that reservation.

Well, Harvey was not only that. In Chicago, he worked with all these things. When my wife and I visited him on the reservation, he had just come from the sweat lodge, and that was full of religious overtones. We went to the Jesuit chapel there, which is one of the very rare places where they have the cross and the peace pipe together, which is something you don't fool around with if you don't know what both of them mean. And we went down the hill to Spring Valley on part of the reservation, where a nun from Mexico City was spending half her sabbatical doing Buddhist meditation. And then Harvey to had to hurry off to Rapid City because it was Rosh Hashanah, and he got in for the Jewish events. And he held it all together. He's now professor at Washington and Lee University teaching these things. I use that as an illustration to say you can't evade it. There's no place to hide.

Marie Felts, I think was her name, had written a book called -- it's about Ophelia, about a young woman, a feminist, people really loved. And her husband got a job in Lincoln, Nebraska. She moved along with him, and people said, you're going to move to the middle of nowhere. Her next book was, The Middle of Everywhere.

[Laughter.]

PROFESSOR MARTY: Lincoln was a hospitable town, and immigration knew it. And there were 130 languages spoken in the school districts of that city of 120,000 or 150,000. If you think it, you'd better make something of it.

The issue is always when there are the many. It's very easy to define yourself by defining the other as the stranger. And it's hazardous, but it's also beneficial and necessary.

At the beginning I asked the question, what's so good about one, and what's so good about the many. What's so bad about the one, and what's so bad about the many. So I'll take off a few things that I think are good, the assets of pluralism.

One, choice. You're not confined. That Czech girl who married the Catholic boy out there really had to break a lot of boundaries. But where there's a rich pluralism, the boundaries can much more easily erode. And if you just take a typical group of American urbanites, for example, and find out all that's there, you'll find very much dimensions. And you have choice. You're not confined by that one.

Which a corollary of that is, you have freedom, and you need freedom. That's where the First Amendment comes in. "Congress shall make no law prohibiting the free exercise of religion" is the coordinate that makes this possible.

Third, pluralism does a great deal for innovation. You don't often do new things unless somebody comes along and does other things. You could still try to clamp them down, and yet when you see them differently, it does change things. I covered the third session of the 2nd Vatican Council after a few weeks into it. And the first week I was there, having read all the books that said the great asset of Catholicism is it's the same everywhere in the world -- Latin Mass is the same. And everywhere you go, it's the same. The morning I was there, Pope Paul was celebrating Mass, and a Congolese seminary had the liturgy in leopard-skin robes. These guys were dancing in front of there. And everybody thought it was really wonderful. You went home and thought, what we do is so boring. We could learn along the way.

And it was a great amplitude in learning each other's along the way, and a lot of it entered the Mass I'm told, but that's not my topics that there's some clamps now on trying to limit all that. But it was fun while it lasted, which is another way of saying that it's much richer. A much richer life.

Graduate students in Chicago, they go to colleges all over the place and teach. And the first thing out here is, I'm at a wonderful campus, but there isn't even a Mexican restaurant within 40 miles. I can't sushi anywhere near here. Food is often the breaker down of the limits there. So richness.

Next stimulus reform. You find that you're doing something offensive, and you don't want to offend, you reform. You do a great deal of that kind of thing, and that's great. And finally there's a chance for cooperation. You team up. You form coalitions and so on.

And then liabilities go with each of these. Along with the choice, you can dilettantism. You can have indifference because you never have to take anything very seriously. You know it's all out there, and you don't really do much with it along the way.

Or freedom can be dizzying. Famous book some years ago, *The Escape From Freedom*, because freedom is dizzying, and here you have that array. How do you do it? Many autobiographies and memoirs of people who come to a faith, Catholicism, born again, Protestant, Buddhism or whatever, would describe having been sampling everything for a while, and starving between, and nothing went with that. And that can often be the corollary of pluralism, dizzying freedom.

Competition and innovation. You're in the middle of all this, and you feel you have to compete, and you're working all the time to make your own thing over against all the others. It can be Protean shallowness after the god Proteus, who could assume a different shape no matter what happened along the way. It could be an old man, it could be a goat, it could be a wave in the ocean. And there's a Protean shallowness along the way.

I flew back from California one time, and the middle seat was vacant, and a woman sat down next to me. I'm not Robert Redford, so that doesn't always happen, but there she was. And what was the attraction? Well, I had some books on that middle seat back when there were still middle seat vacancies, and they were on religion. And she sat down. I sat down next to you because you have some religion books here. I'm very religious, she said. Okay.

[Laughter.]

PROFESSOR MARTY: I trying to read those books. Well, that's interesting, tell me about you. Well, I'm currently a member of the Church of Christ. I was a Jew last year.

[Laughter.]

PROFESSOR MARTY: But I'm a member of the Church of Christ. I said, well, what's it like? Tell me about your -- what's your minister like? What's he like? It's not a he, it's a she. Well, the Church of Christ that I knew in the Middle West wouldn't have dreamed of having a woman minister. So then she wanted me to -- what did I think of transmigration of souls and all that? I said, well, it's not my specialty.

[Laughter.]

PROFESSOR MARTY: Well, she said, I really believe in the Resurrection, and I believe in the trans-migration of souls. They're probably incompatible, but it didn't bother her. All these shapes could take form in front of her.

During the fundamentalism project, we had a great British philosopher, Ernest Gellner, who was describing the future of the world if you don't think through what these are. And whenever he got to the Protean human being, he said, it's a new human species called Californian.

[Laughter.]

PROFESSOR MARTY: And that was the stereotype we had. And yet in California, we'll fight -- we'll meet very fierce fundamentalist groups, every kind of Buddhist group or whatever, by themselves. But the person who stands by and observes them all and have this Protean challenge.

You can overlook the need for rootedness. Humans have that sense of a need for rootedness, and in the midst of pluralism, you don't necessarily engage them. In other words, out of that, you can be merely a relativist. You can be a relativist in a lot of ways, but if you put the adverb in front of it, merely relativist, there's nothing -- grab anything along the way.

One of my former students told about she was teaching somewhere, and she thought she made a big point. And one of the students aid, Mrs. So and So, that was a judgment, a value judgment. She said, it probably. I'm kind of careful about what my value judgments are. We should never make a value judgment. She said, well, okay. I have my values, and Hitlerized his values. I can't make a value judgment? You shouldn't. She said, I started teaching class on what terms. You face the very difficult issue of making judgments, and in a pluralist society, you can often evade that along the way.

So we're left suspended between these two. Todd Courtney Murray, the great Jesuit theorist of American life and of pluralism, one of the great ones, asked in his one of his books, how much can pluralism in a society stand? And he was trying to figure out several. At the time he was writing, America was just moving from Christian, 1940s -- Protestant to Christian, and then Judeo-Christian, and it hadn't yet moved into Judeo-Christian-Muslim, to Abrahamic or whatever. And we always found there somebody new along the way. And he's always asking what does that do.

And so you can react, and to what we study in the Fundamentalism Project. In the midst of the Proteanism and relativism, you find the one, and it cancels out all others. And you have only a negative judgment of everybody else because you've finally found it. A

great number of millions of American do that. They live in the midst of pluralism. They have a nostalgia for what they presumed had been back there in order to force oneness. The dialect of living with and dealing with the other, in other words, is our big problem.

When I write on interfaith relations, I quote the philosopher George Santiana on some of the paradoxes you deal with. In his book Reason and Religion, he said, "All of the religions in the world have some things more or less in common." It's very important for them to find a voice of confluence and so on because it's a very dangerous world if you don't.

But then he went on to say as far as the people in them are concerned, moving into a religion he compares to moving into another room. What makes up that room? He says the strange and idiosyncratic stories we tell. The strange and idiosyncratic stories. They don't look a bit strange if you're in it. And then you hear what the other one does, and it's really strange.

During the Fundamentalism Project, I worked with one of our Muslim scholars. He wasn't allowed in the Mayer Sham Rem in Jerusalem. I barely made it. I had enough orthodox Jewish friends to get by. But we went to the top of the Mount of Olives. No, he took me to the Dome of the Rock first where you see the footprint. If you've ever been in Israel, you've seen this, the footprint of Mohammad's horse the night he ascended. And I'm a scholar of religion, and he pictures me getting together with Turkish coffee or a stronger crowd. Oh, the guy really thinks the horse took off.

And then he took me up to the top of the Mount of Olives or the Chapel of the Ascension. And there's a footprint in alabaster. This is the place where your Savior took off, you know, as a Christian, the ascension. And I picture he's a scholar, he's heard about that, and he was with a Christian today, so he believes this. And he goes back, and he really gets the Turkish coffee. I didn't. I was with a guy today who --

And I say, you know, for 39 years I was a member of a church called the Church of the Ascension. And I heard 39 homilies on the text and I preached three or four of them. And I was dealing with a college group of people who were very sincere believers. I never saw a scholar, somebody trying to make sense of that venture at all. For them, the story is a way of bringing together the human Jesus and the exalted Lord, and they live by the story.

And it says most motivation in religious life comes from these strange and idiosyncratic stories. The Jewish here has strange stories -- Passover. If you just take that story, Passover, it's rough stuff. And that is the saving story.

And he says, out of these marked idiosyncrasies, we get the vistas and mysteries that open us to another world to live. And another world to live in is what a religion does, and he was interested in how you transacted among them, and that's what the Pluralism

Project does. And come back a year from now, and you'll hear Diana Eck describing that. Her classes are full of people who are busy describing the strange and idiosyncratic stories in order to have a more habitable place.

To conclude, why does the National Endowment for the Humanities, why does the project here at this library care about pluralism on these terms? The humanities involve a number of disciplines, and in every one of them you will run into these topics. You can hear from me that I'm a historian, and it makes a big difference what happened in 1965, one of the great dates in American history that nobody noticed because we were busy with Birmingham, and Selma, and civil rights, and all that.

But it's the year that Congress passed the new law on immigration just in time for Southeast Asians to come as the Vietnamese War was making refugees among people - - Vietnamese and Cambodians. And just in time for so many of these changes along the way. You can repeal it piecemeal, but you can't really repeal it because in all these towns -- all these little Iowa towns -- the churches would take them in if nobody else did. So 1965 would be a typical great day for it.

If you're a geographer, and I know we have a geographer in our group, cultural geography. I have a new book by Wilbur Zelinsky on the Geography of Chicago Religion. Really interesting reading all the yellow, orange section all mixed together. And you could find where the Poles were and often still are, the Italians or whatever, every one of our cab drivers. And we soon learned -- we had a Kurdistan the other day. We know where Kurdistan is. Where do you live in Chicago? I spent a lot of time in the church. Where are the Turkish restaurants? That's how you navigate in Chicago along the way. But you have to know some geography to know where to look for it.

Well, on legal history, the First Amendment keeps many, many lawyers busy and many politicians busy. With philosophy and theology, you're busy with the one and the many. The National Endowment for the Humanities describes the field of religious studies. You were allowed now legally to teach comparative religion. Archbishop William Temple said, I don't know what comparative religion is. I know a lot of comparative religious people, but I don't know what comparative religion is. But it was there where you're putting a good name on the fact that you study all of them or more of them.

Poetry and the arts works the imagination. There's not week that the papers that cover the arts don't deal with something that is religious as professed by people in this Nation. The humanistic side of political and social sciences -- this is a list by the Endowment. They're all there. But finding it comes down to experience. Again, you can't even get a bagel or sushi somewhere.

And then I went to Boise State to lecture in Mormon country, and a seminar on environmental ethics. And everybody from graduates, Unitarian Universalists to Wheaton College were there, harmoniously working out of their separate stories so they could face the larger environment.

Alasdair MacIntyre, one of the great philosophers of our time, in his book *After Virtue*, who has a philosophical answer to some of these things I can't follow. But he defines humans as storytelling animals. Storytelling animals. And the question I think we have in the midst of pluralism is, Todd Courtney Murray's, how much of a common narrative do we need along the way? How do we intersect with these separate morals to live in? And I think that instead of tolerance, the word that I've always been advocating along the way is "hospitality."

We all know Xenophobia. Xenost is the word for stranger. Xenophobia. The Greek word Xenophilia is the friendliness to the stranger, which the Jew is commanded to have -- you were once a stranger -- and you learn hospitality. You won't become the other. You don't give up what you are. But you open the door, you serve the meal, you learn, and you hear each other's stories. And that's what this library is committed whenever it brings up the word "pluralism," and that's why I'm having a good week around here.

Thank you very much.

[Applause.]

PROFESSOR MARTY: We have time for some give and take, and they would like if there would be some give and take. And we have microphones, and I will find you.

SPEAKER: Thank you very much, Professor Marty.

I just had a question. In, let's say, an encounter between different religions, and once you're informed about the different traditions and the richness of them, what are the ways to have a meaningful encounter? And how do you, let's say, balance conviction and tolerance in such encounters? Maybe these are two different directions to take the question in.

PROFESSOR MARTY: You have to set up a circumstance normally to have a good conversation. You could accidentally have it, the person next to you on a plane. But to make a civic consequence, you almost have to work it.

I was describing this Interfaith Youth Corps in Chicago and how carefully that's laid out. And I don't know of a single interruption of -- you go around the Nation now, tens of thousands of young people are doing this on campuses. And none of them came equipped for this, but they set up a circumstance.

The philosopher Emanuel Levin has also been very important in his thinking. You deal with the face of the other. Most of the bad stuff in pluralism is when your back is turned or when you're using the Internet or something where you could say anything violates everything.

But if you're in a context, and you meet the other, and you see the face of the other, and you learn their story, you don't convert. You don't solve everything. But you keep the conversation going, and it goes deeper. You have to set up circumstances.

SPEAKER: How do you deal with fundamentalists?

PROFESSOR MARTY: Good question. How do you deal with fundamentalists? Hmm.

[Laughter.]

PROFESSOR MARTY: The same way when you can. I'm on good terms with some folks up in Moody Bible Institute. I had a student write a dissertation once on how people in Chicago in the 1890s got their religion from Dwight Moody, and they got their education from William Rainey Harper, the modernist Baptist at the University of Chicago. And they couldn't figure out why these two guys couldn't get along. They were so nice. Separate worlds with a different world to live in. And you have to work at it.

I've given some lectures there, and, again, circumstances. My son is here, and we took photographs for a book we were doing at Bob Jones University, a Fundamentalist university. Not the kind we were studying because we were studying militant fundamentalists. And as an expert told us when we started out, you'd better know there are no machine guns in the basement of Moody Bible Institute.

[Laughter.]

PROFESSOR MARTY: Because a lot places, there are in militant fundamentalism. But you nurture them.

I don't through what contrivance this came about, but I ended up with a miniature football and a Bob Jones University mug on my desk. It started many good conversations.

[Laughter.]

PROFESSOR MARTY: And made friendly engagements. We had semi-annual meetings at Harvard and Chicago, and at every meeting there were fundamentalists present, and we often invited them. And the one thing they couldn't do was the comparative model. If you had the whole truth, why would you be there with fundamentalists of other religions?

But we had no bad incidents at all. My most memorable was in Georgetown, Texas, where the rule of civility broke down because there was an attorney there who was

extremely smart and extremely fundamentalist. We had a very good exchange along the way. I walked out, and he said, you got dinner plans? And I said, well, my host -- you know, we have dinner plans. Join us, we'll have more fun.

Well, we went to a place, a former bank, and I'm downstairs with the host. He said, come on up, Marty, if you want a drink. Why? Well, you're Lutheran and you're with all these Baptists of Texas, and you can't have wine or beer. Come on up with us. I said, well, you're a strong Fundamentalist. We're the drinking fundamentalists.

[Laughter.]

PROFESSOR MARTY: So I had both kinds. It was lighthearted, and it's my way of saying you disarm, and they will disarm you, and you get along. And you don't win them all. I don't mean that. You don't always get civility out of attempts to get civility. But you get a lot of breakthroughs. It's a good question.

SPEAKER: Thank you. This may be a little off the subject, but when I went to school, and it was public school, vaccination against smallpox was required of children, but exceptions were made for children whose families were Jehovah's witnesses or Christian Scientists. And now we have a problem when something is for the overall good of these children being exempted because while they're not getting vaccination, these diseases could be spread throughout the community. And that seems to be one of the points of conflict.

PROFESSOR MARTY: That's not a bit off the subject. In my metaphor before, that's what goes on in the huts. The Supreme Court is debating exactly these things right now. Today's Tuesday. Thursday we might find a final settlement, 5-4. And it's very relevant to it because if you study the history of this, currently at issue is must Catholics work in an insurance system where they're paying for themselves or not. They're tolerating it in a sense in their place.

I'm not going to settle that for the Supreme Court. I'm going to say that is not new in American life, and you gave two illustrations. Jehovah's witnesses don't allow blood transfusions the way they read the Bible. If you read the history of how that's come out, there have all been often occasions when the courts will seize a child from the parents and administer to them.

In a strange way, if you follow the stories, a lot of the parents almost welcome that. They love that child, and they'd rather the child is alive, and they have a good conscience because they resisted the intrusion. Christian Science has some of the same.

But if you really think about it, it's a very big issue in fluoridation of water because if you're in a place where there's fluoridation of water and it is a medicine, you are getting

it and you have no choice unless you go down to the lake and pull it out yourself. If you just take the number of things that all of us live with that violates somebody's conscience, if you're big enough and powerful enough or extreme enough, you get the attention of it.

But I think in a sense, the life of a republic is built on certain kinds of compromises along the way. And I think what we're trying to do in this one, the Administration is trying to find a compromise where it would work. And the public sits there and tell what's going on. Every survey I've seen, 98 percent of the Roman Catholics of child-bearing age use contraception or are open to it, so it's a fight between two different powers.

And where we go from here, I don't know, but after that, there'll be another one. If you have a vital society, you're going to have firmly believing people. And you can say my children are in danger because -- smallpox was almost wiped out, and in some places it's coming back and it's dangerous because of somebody's conviction.

It's not always a formally religious conviction. Remember I said it can be non-religion. It can be anti-religion. But it has to be taken the same way. I was draft counselor during the Vietnamese War, and we saw -- it's not hard to get exemption from -- if you're a pacifist. If you resist all wars, they just give a job cleaning for four years. But selective exemption, there was no law for it. And we would deal with young people -- at that time, young men -- who were profoundly religious and could make their case sort of on religious grounds. And so the Court began to broaden it a little bit.

One of the famous cases, a friend of Horace Kallen we were talking about before, Leo Pfeffer -- they were changing the regulations so that you could have a -- there was a rule if you have a belief in the Supreme Being. And they were arguing there are religions in America that don't believe in a Supreme Being. So they asked Feiffer to come up with names, and so we went out to lunch and thought, well, Unitarian Universalists, one wing of that doesn't have a Supreme Being. Mahayana Buddhism. And they said secular humanism. In other words, you can be devoted to it the same way that people who are religious are that. I wish we hadn't done that because all of a sudden now, everybody is labeled secular humanist.

And then one case further. Somebody said, I don't want to be anything like this, non-theist religion or whatever. And the Court finally decided if you believe in such a thing with sufficient intensity, et cetera, it almost in a sense denigrates along the way. And we don't have a real solution to it, but we never will. And that's probably a good thing because, again, my word of dynamic republic -- the alternative of oneness is a Christian society will follow those laws and where a Judeo Christian will follow those laws, is more intolerable. And we learned our lessons in that, and we hope Egypt doesn't go the other way all the way.

One more.

SPEAKER: Yeah. I'd like to ask a question, Dr. Marty. You spoke about the cross and the peace pipe being displayed together, and offered that people need to know what those means in order to identify what the symbolism might be. Could you elaborate on what the peace pipe and cross being put together reveals?

PROFESSOR MARTY: I'm not an expert on all of them, but the Lakota Sioux are the ones I know best, and many Native Americans that use a peace pipe, which were the Plains Indians most of all. It's a sacrament. And it's profaning it when you use it out of context in old movies, Annie, Get Your Gun and son. There were no dances they were doing with the peace pipe. To them, that would be just as if you're taking the Christian cross and profaning it or anything of that sort.

There are probably people in this building that know more about it than I, but the experience I've had has been -- the easiest word is to say they created the pipe itself and what you're doing with it as a sacrament.

SPEAKER: Dr. Marty, how do you walk the fine line between science and religion? More specifically, because on one side you have science, which is more or less they think or many times they know everything, and in a couple of years that changes quickly. And then on the other hand, you have religion who thinks, at the same time, they know everything. And many times the two conflict. How do you reconcile the two?

PROFESSOR MARTY: I don't trust anybody that doesn't have some conflict going on in them between the very different systems we have. And I hang out with a lot of scientists who are profoundly -- I've just been invited to be in a movie about one of them. Who are profoundly theologically informed.

Just one sample out of many, Don Polkinghorne is probably the best-known right now. Physicist, world-renowned physicist, Nobel level, and a theologian, and explicitly a religious Christian. Francis Collins, who is head of the Genome Project, a conservative Christian to my taste along the way. How they all do it, I don't quite know.

It's part of the search for meaning and a different set of symbolism along the way. Most of them know that you can deal with science in many different ways. You can deal with science straight out empirically, but you can also turn it into kind of an inclusive theology, as it were. And hearing the dialogue between the two, they're above my pay level. But I'm charmed by them.

It depends on which science, too. Actually a bigger problem for faith in some of the humanities, if you just check Andrew Greeley, Father Andrew Greeley would measure this all the time, and he'd find anthropology -- it's a lot harder to be an explicit believer in a field like anthropology, which is seen as relativism, looking on people from a distance, and then getting inside their world and finding difference along the way.

The hard sciences, many of the fundamentalists, for example, who are in hard sciences are very fundamentalist, and they are very good at that science. But they don't get into the theories behind science, so there's a limit along the way. You have to have the circumstances, like I said before to this first question. But there's a lot going on in the field.

SPEAKER: My question is you talked about pluralism gave rise to tolerance, and we have to tolerate, and still have an open line of communications and so on. But what I see and kind of -- as an educator is like I see some danger to that because our society became politically correct. And we have to really watch we say, and even in explanation, we have to choose, you know, we have to make sure that we are not offending anybody, even if it is the truth we believe we are trying to communicate.

And then that would lead also to lack of deep conversations of something because the real conversation, you know, you meet with a friend or with somebody, maybe a co-worker or something, and you get in conversations. Sometimes those deep conversation, you know, are so exciting. Maybe you reach something or not, but with the idea of tolerance and politically correct and all of that and not offending anybody. It becomes so banal and so boring actually.

PROFESSOR MARTY: I think extreme political correctness was a necessary stage, but I don't think that's where it has to rule anymore. It's been a long time. It's like Title 9 and so on. It had to be almost legalistic and forced because we had no habits for it.

I don't find that so. We're more sensitive than we used to be. A couple of publishers who want to reprint some books I wrote 25, 30 years ago when human beings were all he. Well, that's part of the ethos that you generate along the way.

But I don't think it has to break down relations along the way, and I think people have to have more courage in the way you do it. Religion is often a part of it. But if you develop good relations and so on, you could do it. It's hard if you have an academic setting where you have a department where they just insist on it that way. In five years, they won't anymore.

SPEAKER: Okay. You might be retired by then.

[Laughter.]

PROFESSOR MARTY: I'm an antiquated partner of hope. Yes?

SPEAKER: I was puzzled by some of your comments about rootedness. Rootedness seems to be perhaps the antithesis of pluralism. Maybe that's what you were getting to.

But how you said rootedness is a natural inclination of people, is that what has to be diminished or combatted to promote pluralism?

PROFESSOR MARTY: Well, again, I don't think they have to be in contradiction. You have to be aware of how the two relate. Being rooted, having identity, is a great gift. People are looking for this. They're lost and so on, and invent a fake identity to try it on and see how it works. Just to be tossed by the wind doesn't do much good. So rootedness -- Su Moon Lao wrote a real great book on the need for roots, a profound study, the psychology of it.

Most of the people in the world are very poor, and they have no gated communities. They have no locks on the door or whatever. If they need any security, they're going to have to ask their tribe, their people around them, or that. And they get roots from it. Now they may move far from it, and yet some of it stays.

I would open many classes in which each student, I'd say, tell me your story. What have your people been doing ever since they got off the boat. And Native Americans say, well, you're talking about 30,000 years ago, I guess.

[Laughter.]

PROFESSOR MARTY: When we came by land up there. But they all know what I meant. And almost all -- of course, I was teaching William James' Rise of the Religious Experience, so they knew religion was there. But you don't find many people can tell the story of their three generations or two generations here without religion infringing on it. And they settle things among themselves as they get into that.

One of my courses, she's a profound teacher now. She was way, way back when Purdue still had -- before political correctness, they had golden girls, right? Purdue had golden girls. She was a golden girl. And about the second day, William James talks about suffering, and she talked very eloquently about suffering. And the guy next to her said, what do you know about suffering? This is a high tuition school, and I know you got a free ride because you're smart and beautiful, and all that stuff. Suffering. She said, should I tell him, Mr. Marty? She said, didn't you read my dossier? And I said, I never do. You tell me your story, but I don't want to --

Well, she had a very bad case of fibromyalgia. Her smile came from the constant medication she had. She also -- she was 19. When I was 15, I had a son, and he's the joy of my life, but it's a little problem when you're second year undergrad. The guy next to her said, well, at least -- I'm glad to hear you didn't join some nut outfit like Christian Science. On the other side of her -- we don't have any football players. We had one, and he said, I'm a Christian Scientist, and I resent that.

[Laughter.]

PROFESSOR MARTY: Well, that was the second week of an 11-week term. I had no more problems with that.

[Laughter.]

PROFESSOR MARTY: People do work this out in huts around the world, and we grow from it. And the alternatives are worse. But I think -- and you become sort of a -- I always kid about this in my own case. I was an ordained minister, and I spoke at the University of Missouri a couple of years ago. Your bio says you're an ordained minister, a Lutheran. What kind of Lutheran are you? There are a lot of them, and which one are you? I said, I'm a fanatic Lutheran.

[Laughter.]

PROFESSOR MARTY: What's that? I quoted Mr. Dooley, the Chicago satirical figure. A fanatic is someone who knows he's doing exactly what the Lord would do if the Lord were also in possession of the facts.

[Laughter.]

PROFESSOR MARTY: So I said, I'm rooted, and I really am. But I've spent since the 1950s in interfaith dialogue, and my heroes -- Abraham Joshua Heschel, very profoundly Jewish. Pope John the 23rd, amazingly rooted, and yet always reaching out to the others, and so on.

And that has to be studied, and I think that's why the National Endowment for the Humanities -- to put in a plug for our sponsors -- cares about college teachers having these things as well because they're on the front line. They're the people who had never had the experience of the other and are suddenly thrown into a university classroom where everybody around them is different. How do we negotiate that?

But I dare not go on longer, or I will have violated the ethos of this event.

[Applause.]

[Whereupon, the event was adjourned.]

